

## **REMARKS**

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed January 7, 2005. Claims 1-25 were rejected. Claims 1, 10, and 17 have been amended. Claims 1-25 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Shandony (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,261). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Anticipation under §102(e) requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As discussed below, Shandony fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

In regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Shandony does not teach or suggest “determining a first group access control list for the first group name, wherein the first group access control list comprises the user IDs of users whose entries comprise the first group name, and wherein the first group access control list is stored outside of the directory.” Shandony discloses an access control system in which a group entry in an LDAP directory defines a list of users who belong to a particular group (see, e.g., Fig. 5 and column 8, lines 12-26). As explained in Applicant’s “Background of the Invention,” directory-based access control systems such as Shandony’s may be hindered by a size limit for group entries in a directory such as an LDAP directory. Applicant’s claimed invention may circumvent this size limit by creating an access control list which is stored outside of the directory and which is therefore subject to more generous size limits for files in the underlying file system, not size limits for directory entries.

To expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended the independent claims to clarify that the access control list is stored outside of the directory itself. Support for the amendments may be found in Figure 5; page 3, lines 24-28; and page 12, lines 11-28 of Applicant's specification.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 17 are patentably distinct from Shandony. The remaining dependent claims provide additional limitations and are therefore thought allowable for at least the same reasons.

In regard to claim 3, Applicant respectfully submits that Shandony does not teach or suggest "for each data source in the multi-user computing environment which permits access by the first hostname, granting access to the data source to the one or more users whose directory entries comprise the first hostname and who are seeking access from the host having the first hostname." Although the Office Action cited numerous locations in Shandony (Figures 1, 3, and 5, and column 16, lines 44-60) with regard to Applicant's claim 3, Applicant cannot find any teaching or suggestion in Shandony of user entries comprising hostnames. Furthermore, Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion in Shandony of granting access to a user based on the hostnames in the user's directory entry and the hostname from which the user is attempting to gain access. Claims 12 and 19 are thought allowable for at least the same reasons.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that claims 1-25 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §102(e) rejections.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5181-82200/BNK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin  
Reg. No. 33,929  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, Texas 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8840  
Date: April 7, 2005